

# **ATTACHMENT 9**

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
) Case No.  
vs. ) 5:14-cv-05344-BLF (PSG)  
)  
ARISTA NETWORKS, INC., )  
)  
Defendant. )  
)  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF KEVIN C. ALMEROTH  
San Francisco, California  
Tuesday, June 28, 2016  
Volume I

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Reported by:  
CARLA SOARES  
CSR No. 5908  
Job No. 2337647  
Pages 1 - 296

Page 1

## HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	1 INDEX
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	2 WITNESS
3 SAN JOSE DIVISION	3 KEVIN C. ALMEROTH EXAMINATION
4	Volume I
5 CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., )	4
6 )	5 BY MR. SILBERT 7
6 Plaintiff, )	6
7 ) Case No.	7 EXHIBITS
7 vs. ) 5:14-cv-05344-BLF (PSG)	8 NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE
8 )	9 Exhibit 1538 Opening Expert Report of Kevin 20
8 ARISTA NETWORKS, INC., )	10 Almeroth Regarding Copying
9 )	11
9 Defendant. )	12 Exhibit 1539 Rebuttal Expert Report of Kevin 75
10 )	13 Almeroth
10 _____)	14
11	15 Exhibit 1540 Expert Report of John R. Black, 95
12	16 Jr.
13	17
14	18 Exhibit 1541 Handwritten document 204
15	19
16 VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF KEVIN C.	20 --o0o--
17 ALMEROTH, Volume I, taken on behalf of Defendant, at	21
18 633 Battery Street, San Francisco, California	22
19 beginning at 8:34 a.m., and ending at 5:43 p.m., on	23
20 Tuesday, June 28, 2016, before CARLA SOARES,	24
21 Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 5908.	25
22	
23	
24	
25	
Page 2	Page 4
1 APPEARANCES:	1 REFERENCED EXHIBITS
2	2 (Not attached)
3 For the Plaintiff:	3 Exhibit Page
4 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP	4 1503 160
5 BY: ANDREW M. HOLMES, Attorney at Law	5 639 174
6 50 California Street, 22nd Floor	6 1504 175
7 San Francisco, California 94111	7 1505 183
8 415.875.6322	8 1506 184
9 drewholmes@quinnemanuel.com	9 1523 187
10	10 1500 194
11	11
12 For the Defendant:	12 --o0o--
13 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP	13
14 BY: DAVID J. SILBERT, Attorney at Law	14
15 RYAN WONG, Attorney at Law	15
16 633 Battery Street	16
17 San Francisco, California 94111	17
18 415.391.5400	18
19 dsilbert@kvn.com	19
20 rwong@kvn.com	20
21	21
22 ALSO PRESENT: John Black	22
23 Sean Grant, Video Operator	23
24	24
25 --o0o--	25
Page 3	Page 5

## HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1 San Francisco, California	1 other times I've testified under deposition. I 08:36:01
2 Tuesday, June 28, 2016	2 don't know that there's a distinction in what
3 8:34 a.m.	3 Mr. Holmes said.
4	4 Q Okay. Are you asking the court to
5 PROCEEDINGS	5 recognize you as an expert in this matter? 08:36:14
6 THE VIDEO OPERATOR: Good morning. We're	6 A I don't know that I'd be asking the court
7 on the record. The time is 8:34 a.m., and the date	7 to do that, but certainly, I think my qualifications
8 is June 28th, 2016. This begins the videotaped	8 justify that the court see me as an expert.
9 deposition of Dr. Kevin Almeroth.	9 Q On what subjects relevant to the opinions
10 My name is Sean Grant, here with our court 08:34:13	10 expressed in your reports do you claim to be an 08:36:37
11 reporter, Carla Soares. We're here from Veritext	11 expert?
12 Legal Solutions at the request of counsel for	12 A I'm not sure I understand the question. I
13 defendant.	13 don't know that I can sit here and come up with the
14 This deposition is being held at Kecker &	14 definitive list of subjects.
15 Van Nest LLP in San Francisco, California. The 08:34:24	15 I think on any of the subjects that I 08:36:58
16 caption of this case is Cisco Systems, Inc., versus	16 testify about and offer opinions about, I believe
17 Arista Networks, Inc., Case No. 5:14-cv-05344-BLF.	17 I'm qualified as an expert.
18 Please note that audio- and	18 Q Are you an expert in computer science?
19 video-recording will take place unless all parties	19 A I believe I am.
20 have agreed to go off the record. Microphones are 08:34:45	20 Q Are you an expert in networking 08:37:09
21 sensitive and may pick up whispers, private	21 technology?
22 conversations, or cellular interference.	22 A I believe I am.
23 At this time, will counsel please identify	23 Q Are you an expert in network device
24 themselves and state whom they represent.	24 operating systems?
25 MR. HOLMES: Drew Holmes on behalf of 08:34:58	25 A I believe I am. 08:37:19
Page 6	Page 8
1 Cisco, as well as the witness, from Quinn Emanuel. 08:35:00	1 Q From -- for how many different network 08:37:24
2 MR. SILBERT: David Silbert, Kecker &	2 device vendors have you reviewed any source code for
3 Van Nest, on behalf of defendant Arista.	3 their network device operating systems?
4 MR. WONG: Ryan Wong of Kecker & Van Nest	4 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Vague.
5 on behalf of Arista. 08:35:11	5 THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, or just 08:37:39
6 THE VIDEO OPERATOR: And also present?	6 in the conjunction -- just in conjunction with this
7 MR. BLACK: I'm John Black. I'm an expert	7 case?
8 witness for Arista.	8 BY MR. SILBERT:
9 THE VIDEO OPERATOR: Will the certified	9 Q Well, why don't we take them one by one.
10 court reporter please swear in the witness. 08:35:29	10 First, in conjunction with this case, for 08:37:47
11 KEVIN C. ALMEROTH,	11 how many network device vendors have you reviewed
12 having been administered an oath, was examined and	12 any source code for their network device operating
13 testified as follows:	13 systems?
14 EXAMINATION	14 A Sitting here right now, I specifically
15 BY MR. SILBERT: 08:35:31	15 recall two: Cisco and Arista. There might have 08:38:04
16 Q Good morning, Dr. Almeroth.	16 been others. I just don't remember them.
17 A Good morning.	17 Q And generally speaking, for how many
18 Q A minute ago counsel for Cisco introduced	18 different network device vendors have you reviewed
19 himself as representing Cisco and also representing	19 any source code for their network device operating
20 you in your capacity as a witness. 08:35:41	20 systems? 08:38:22
21 Is it your understanding that you're being	21 A Maybe ten.
22 represented in your capacity as a witness today by	22 Q Can you name them?
23 the Quinn Emanuel law firm?	23 A In addition to Cisco and Arista, I believe
24 A I don't have an understanding that the	24 I've reviewed source code for A10, maybe F5, 3Com.
25 representation is any different than any of the 08:35:59	25 Quagga is an open source so I've looked at source 08:38:49
Page 7	Page 9



## HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

<p>1 your rebuttal report and your figures for the counts 11:07:56</p> <p>2 of IOS commands that were copied are an</p> <p>3 apples-to-apples comparison?</p> <p>4 A I believe that the comparison in counts is</p> <p>5 an appropriate and consistent comparison between 11:08:10</p> <p>6 Cisco and Arista.</p> <p>7 Q You're not willing to say apples to</p> <p>8 apples?</p> <p>9 A I said apples to apples before. I think</p> <p>10 apples to apples is what I just answered. 11:08:20</p> <p>11 Q Okay. Did you review Dr. Black's opening</p> <p>12 report carefully?</p> <p>13 A I did.</p> <p>14 Q And in Dr. Black's report, he provides</p> <p>15 data on the use of CLI elements by a number of 11:08:39</p> <p>16 network device vendors, correct?</p> <p>17 A I think --</p> <p>18 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Vague.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I think his report speaks</p> <p>20 for itself. I know that he had reference to some 11:08:56</p> <p>21 materials about counts in his report. We can</p> <p>22 certainly get it out and look at it. As well as my</p> <p>23 report, I don't have his report memorized.</p> <p>24 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>25 Q Do you recall a section in Dr. Black's 11:09:14</p>	<p>1 BY MR. SILBERT: 11:11:02</p> <p>2 Q Dr. Almeroth, I've marked as Exhibit 1540</p> <p>3 a copy of Dr. Black's opening report. And as a</p> <p>4 frame of reference, let me direct your attention to</p> <p>5 the section beginning at paragraph 199 of 11:11:20</p> <p>6 Dr. Black's report.</p> <p>7 A Do you have a page number?</p> <p>8 Q No. I wish I did.</p> <p>9 A Okay. It will just take me a second.</p> <p>10 Q Yeah. 11:11:38</p> <p>11 A Page 91. So this is the first paragraph</p> <p>12 under the "ADTRAN CLI" section?</p> <p>13 Q Yeah. That's where I was focusing you on,</p> <p>14 at least to get our bearings. And feel free to scan</p> <p>15 to reorient yourself to Dr. Black's report, for a 11:12:16</p> <p>16 few hundred paragraphs after this, to at least,</p> <p>17 let's say, 439.</p> <p>18 A Okay. Before I go through all of those</p> <p>19 pages --</p> <p>20 Q I don't want you to read them all. I just 11:12:43</p> <p>21 want you to scan them and reorient yourself to it.</p> <p>22 I know you've already read it carefully.</p> <p>23 Does looking at these pages refresh your</p> <p>24 recollection that Dr. Black provided information in</p> <p>25 his report on the use of IOS CLI elements by other 11:12:57</p>
<p>1 report where he discusses a number of different 11:09:16</p> <p>2 switch vendors in alphabetical order and talks about</p> <p>3 their use of CLI elements in common with Cisco IOS</p> <p>4 CLI?</p> <p>5 A I believe he had something along those 11:09:34</p> <p>6 lines. But sitting here now, the fact that it was</p> <p>7 alphabetical, I don't recall.</p> <p>8 So along those same lines, I don't recall</p> <p>9 your characterization of what is in his report as</p> <p>10 something I necessarily can agree with without 11:09:48</p> <p>11 seeing it.</p> <p>12 Q Do you recall that Dr. Black provided</p> <p>13 exhibits to his report in which he provided data on</p> <p>14 use of CLI elements in IOS by other network switch</p> <p>15 vendors? 11:10:03</p> <p>16 A So it would be the same answer.</p> <p>17 I think you're characterizing his report.</p> <p>18 I don't have his report in front of me. I don't</p> <p>19 know that I can agree with your characterization.</p> <p>20 As I've said previously, I know he has 11:10:18</p> <p>21 talked about other switch vendors and what commands</p> <p>22 they have, and I've provided a rebuttal analysis in</p> <p>23 Exhibit 1539.</p> <p>24 (Exhibit 1540 was marked for</p> <p>25 identification and is attached hereto.) 11:10:29</p>	<p>1 network switch vendors? 11:13:03</p> <p>2 A I think the report speaks for itself as to</p> <p>3 what it includes.</p> <p>4 Q Do you, in your two reports anywhere,</p> <p>5 dispute the data that Dr. Black presents on the use 11:13:22</p> <p>6 of Cisco CLI elements by other network device</p> <p>7 vendors?</p> <p>8 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Calls for a legal</p> <p>9 conclusion.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure exactly what 11:13:42</p> <p>11 you mean by "data" and which portions you're</p> <p>12 considering to be the data.</p> <p>13 So for example, for ADTRAN, in</p> <p>14 paragraph 199, I don't recall disagreeing with the</p> <p>15 statements in that paragraph. But to the level of 11:13:58</p> <p>16 whether or not I accept everything that he's</p> <p>17 identified as correct, I don't recall that I've done</p> <p>18 that.</p> <p>19 I think my report speaks for itself, and</p> <p>20 I've included opinions about how he -- at least with 11:14:14</p> <p>21 regard to how he interprets the information he's</p> <p>22 presented. But ultimately, I think how I've</p> <p>23 rebutted these opinions is in my reports.</p> <p>24 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>25 Q I understand -- I'm not asking you to say 11:14:35</p>

Page 95

Page 96

25 (Pages 94 - 97)



## HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

<p>1 that you agree with his interpretation of the data 11:14:36</p> <p>2 or his opinions. I understand you disagree there.</p> <p>3 But let me try to break it down.</p> <p>4 In Dr. Black's report, he provides figures</p> <p>5 on the number of accused CLI commands that are also 11:14:49</p> <p>6 used by other network switch vendors besides Arista,</p> <p>7 correct?</p> <p>8 MR. HOLMES: Objection. The document</p> <p>9 speaks for itself.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: If you want to point me to a 11:15:08</p> <p>11 table you're suggesting, I can certainly look at it.</p> <p>12 I think ultimately, as I've testified to</p> <p>13 generally about both my report and his, I think it</p> <p>14 speaks for itself as to what it's including.</p> <p>15 BY MR. SILBERT: 11:15:27</p> <p>16 Q Okay. Could you look at paragraph 208,</p> <p>17 please?</p> <p>18 A Okay.</p> <p>19 Q I'll start reading in the middle of the</p> <p>20 paragraph. It says in Dr. Black's report, "A 11:15:39</p> <p>21 detailed analysis of the overlap between the ADTRAN</p> <p>22 networking equipment CLIs and Cisco CLIs is provided</p> <p>23 in Appendix H.AD. As shown in that detailed</p> <p>24 analysis, ADTRAN has supported at least 178 of the</p> <p>25 same Cisco CLI commands that are disputed in this 11:16:02</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p>	<p>1 as correct. 11:17:00</p> <p>2 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>3 Q My question is, do you, in your reports,</p> <p>4 dispute them?</p> <p>5 Would you look back, please, a little 11:17:10</p> <p>6 earlier in paragraph 204?</p> <p>7 A Okay.</p> <p>8 Q Do you see here there's a table in this</p> <p>9 paragraph which Dr. Black describes as a comparison</p> <p>10 of disputed Cisco command modes and prompts and the 11:17:24</p> <p>11 AOS CLI command modes and prompts as of April 2003?</p> <p>12 A I see that sentence in his report.</p> <p>13 Q You don't, anywhere in your reports,</p> <p>14 dispute that ADTRAN AOS used the CLI command modes</p> <p>15 and prompts that are shown in Dr. Black's table 11:17:45</p> <p>16 here, do you?</p> <p>17 A I don't have my report memorized, and I</p> <p>18 would just say that I think my report speaks for</p> <p>19 itself.</p> <p>20 Q As you sit here today, you can't point me 11:17:56</p> <p>21 to any portion of your report where you dispute the</p> <p>22 data that's presented here, can you?</p> <p>23 A As I sit here today, no. It's a long</p> <p>24 report and I'd have to look through it and see. But</p> <p>25 I don't have it memorized and can't point you to 11:18:08</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p>
<p>1 lawsuit." 11:16:05</p> <p>2 Do you see that?</p> <p>3 A I see what's in the report.</p> <p>4 Q And did you review Appendix H.AD?</p> <p>5 A Yes. 11:16:15</p> <p>6 Q Did you review all the appendices to</p> <p>7 Dr. Black's report?</p> <p>8 A I did.</p> <p>9 Q Did you review them carefully?</p> <p>10 A I did. 11:16:20</p> <p>11 Q You don't, anywhere in your reports,</p> <p>12 dispute the statement that ADTRAN has supported at</p> <p>13 least 178 of the same Cisco CLI commands that are</p> <p>14 disputed in this lawsuit, do you?</p> <p>15 A I don't recall that I do specifically. I 11:16:34</p> <p>16 think the report speaks for itself, my report does.</p> <p>17 Q As you sit here today, you're not aware of</p> <p>18 anything in your reports that disputes that, are</p> <p>19 you?</p> <p>20 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Asked and 11:16:42</p> <p>21 answered.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I -- as I sit here today, I</p> <p>23 don't recall, but I don't have my report memorized.</p> <p>24 And I would also add that to the extent</p> <p>25 that I don't doesn't mean that I accept his findings 11:16:55</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p>	<p>1 something specific. 11:18:11</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And we've been looking at examples</p> <p>3 for ADTRAN, which is the first in Dr. Black's long</p> <p>4 list of network switch vendors.</p> <p>5 But isn't it true that the answers are the 11:18:24</p> <p>6 same for every company he lists?</p> <p>7 In other words, you don't, anywhere in</p> <p>8 your reports, dispute the accuracy of Dr. Black's</p> <p>9 statements about the number of CLI commands used by</p> <p>10 other network device vendors that are at issue in 11:18:39</p> <p>11 this case?</p> <p>12 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Compound, vague,</p> <p>13 and calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I would give similar answers</p> <p>15 to what I just gave. I don't -- I think my report 11:18:50</p> <p>16 speaks for itself. I don't have it memorized. It's</p> <p>17 a fairly lengthy report. I have included responses</p> <p>18 to his opinions. But as I sit here today, I don't</p> <p>19 recall that I have questioned any of the specific</p> <p>20 data. But again, I think the report speaks for 11:19:09</p> <p>21 itself.</p> <p>22 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>23 Q And is it also true that you would give</p> <p>24 the same answers if I asked you whether you disputed</p> <p>25 any of the information Dr. Black presents on other 11:19:20</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p>



## HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

<p>1 network switch vendors' use of CLI modes, prompts, 11:19:24</p> <p>2 or responses, command responses, that are used in</p> <p>3 Cisco IOS?</p> <p>4 MR. HOLMES: Same objections.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: That covers a lot of ground. 11:19:41</p> <p>6 And what I would say is, I would defer to what my</p> <p>7 report says.</p> <p>8 I've included the opinions in my report.</p> <p>9 And to the extent I haven't addressed one of the</p> <p>10 particular aspects that are within the scope of your 11:19:54</p> <p>11 question, it shouldn't be meant that I agree with</p> <p>12 his findings.</p> <p>13 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>14 Q I'm not -- again, to be clear, I'm not</p> <p>15 asking you whether you agree with them. I'm asking 11:20:05</p> <p>16 you what you've disclosed as your opinions in your</p> <p>17 report.</p> <p>18 Isn't it true that in your reports, you</p> <p>19 don't dispute anywhere the accuracy of the data that</p> <p>20 Dr. Black presents in his opening report on the 11:20:21</p> <p>21 number of CLI -- and identity of CLI elements used</p> <p>22 in Cisco's CLIs that are also used by other network</p> <p>23 device vendors?</p> <p>24 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Vague, compound.</p> <p>25 The documents speak for themselves. 11:20:37</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p>	<p>1 "Dell's corporate representatives stated under oath 11:22:30</p> <p>2 that Dell had not copied Cisco's IOS CLI and that he</p> <p>3 was not aware of anyone else in the industry copying</p> <p>4 Cisco, and that Dell has its own commands that</p> <p>5 others have not used," and then you quote some 11:22:45</p> <p>6 testimony on the next page there, right?</p> <p>7 A I do see that.</p> <p>8 Q Do you believe that it's a balanced and</p> <p>9 fair appraisal of the evidence that you've reviewed</p> <p>10 in the case to say that you're not aware of any 11:22:56</p> <p>11 evidence that Dell has copied Cisco CLI?</p> <p>12 A I think that you have to look at the</p> <p>13 opinions that I've included in the middle of that</p> <p>14 paragraph.</p> <p>15 And what I'm saying is, I have seen no 11:23:29</p> <p>16 such evidence that even comes close to this level of</p> <p>17 copying with respect to HP, and then similarly for</p> <p>18 Dell.</p> <p>19 The analysis that I've done has been with</p> <p>20 respect to Arista. And as I testified to this 11:23:43</p> <p>21 morning with respect to copying and plagiarism, part</p> <p>22 of what you need to do is to look at the evidence</p> <p>23 beyond just the existence of similarities.</p> <p>24 You can start with similarities and</p> <p>25 progress from there. In the case of Arista, there 11:24:04</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p>
<p>1 THE WITNESS: I would essentially give you 11:20:40</p> <p>2 the same answer that I gave to the last question.</p> <p>3 I think the report speaks for itself, and</p> <p>4 the point really is, even though I haven't responded</p> <p>5 to his particular statements doesn't mean that I 11:20:53</p> <p>6 accept his data as correct.</p> <p>7 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>8 Q Your testimony is that you've seen no</p> <p>9 evidence that other switch vendors besides Arista</p> <p>10 and Huawei have copied Cisco CLI; is that right? 11:21:09</p> <p>11 A I believe there's an opinion along those</p> <p>12 lines. You can point me to the paragraph in my</p> <p>13 report that you're referring to.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. Let's take one specific example.</p> <p>15 I'm looking at your opening report, which is 11:21:31</p> <p>16 Exhibit 1538. Would you look, please, at</p> <p>17 paragraph 97 on page 39?</p> <p>18 I must have that wrong. It must be your</p> <p>19 rebuttal report. Yeah, I apologize. I meant to say</p> <p>20 your rebuttal report. 11:22:10</p> <p>21 MR. HOLMES: Which page is that?</p> <p>22 MR. SILBERT: Page 39, paragraph 97.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>24 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>25 Q Looking at the bottom of page 39, you say, 11:22:27</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p>	<p>1 is admissions from Arista corporate representatives 11:24:07</p> <p>2 and witnesses that they copied commands,</p> <p>3 documentation, command modes, prompts. The whole</p> <p>4 list of things.</p> <p>5 There isn't that kind of evidence for HP 11:24:25</p> <p>6 and Dell. And to the extent that as one of its</p> <p>7 defenses, Arista and Dr. Black want to say that Dell</p> <p>8 has copied, then there would need to be some</p> <p>9 additional evidence beyond just the similarities in</p> <p>10 commands. 11:24:47</p> <p>11 And so based on the evidence that I've</p> <p>12 seen, which wasn't really the focus of my</p> <p>13 investigation, to generate evidence or ask for</p> <p>14 evidence that would potentially require subpoenaing</p> <p>15 Dell and HP, there isn't any such evidence of 11:25:04</p> <p>16 copying.</p> <p>17 And to the extent Dr. Black makes an</p> <p>18 argument that there is copying based on</p> <p>19 similarities, I'm saying in paragraph 97 that it</p> <p>20 doesn't rise to the level of evidence with respect 11:25:23</p> <p>21 to Arista's copying.</p> <p>22 Q Would you please look at Exhibit I to the</p> <p>23 Black report, Exhibit 1540?</p> <p>24 You reviewed this exhibit carefully before</p> <p>25 you prepared your rebuttal report, didn't you? 11:25:53</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p>

## HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

<p>1 BY MR. SILBERT: 11:41:07</p> <p>2 Q Have you seen statements by Dell to the</p> <p>3 effect that Dell uses a, quote, industry standard</p> <p>4 CLI?</p> <p>5 A I don't recall, sitting here now. There's 11:41:18</p> <p>6 been a lot of evidence in the case. I don't have it</p> <p>7 memorized.</p> <p>8 If there's a document to that effect, I</p> <p>9 can certainly take a look at it. To the extent it's</p> <p>10 been addressed or discussed in any of the reports, 11:41:31</p> <p>11 then we can go over those opinions.</p> <p>12 Q Have you seen statements by Brocade that</p> <p>13 Brocade uses a, quote, industry standard CLI?</p> <p>14 A Again, it would be the same answer.</p> <p>15 I don't have all the documents memorized. 11:41:47</p> <p>16 And to the extent any have been identified or</p> <p>17 presented, then I would have responded to those in</p> <p>18 my reports.</p> <p>19 Q You say in your rebuttal report that</p> <p>20 Arista and Huawei are the only two companies Cisco 11:42:03</p> <p>21 is/was aware of that were infringing Cisco's</p> <p>22 copyrighted works; is that correct?</p> <p>23 A You would have to point me to that part of</p> <p>24 the report.</p> <p>25 Q Paragraph 168 on page 85 of your rebuttal 11:42:20</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p>	<p>1 information to draw a conclusion. 11:44:07</p> <p>2 The conclusions that I've offered with</p> <p>3 respect to Dell are based on -- are stated in the</p> <p>4 report and are based on the evidence that exists for</p> <p>5 Dell. 11:44:19</p> <p>6 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>7 Q Your testimony as an expert on behalf of</p> <p>8 Cisco is that Cisco isn't aware that D-Link, which</p> <p>9 uses over 300 of just the commands at issue in this</p> <p>10 case, along with other CLI elements, is infringing 11:44:32</p> <p>11 Cisco's copyright?</p> <p>12 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Foundation,</p> <p>13 misstates the testimony, misstates the document.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I understand</p> <p>15 the question. 11:44:45</p> <p>16 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>17 Q Your testimony -- strike that.</p> <p>18 Dr. Black presents information about</p> <p>19 D-Link's CLI and the overlaps between D-Link and</p> <p>20 Cisco in his expert report, right? 11:45:00</p> <p>21 A I think his expert report speaks for</p> <p>22 itself.</p> <p>23 Q And you, in your expert reports, haven't</p> <p>24 disputed the accuracy of the data that he presents</p> <p>25 about the D-Link CLI, correct? 11:45:09</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p>
<p>1 report. 11:42:24</p> <p>2 A Okay.</p> <p>3 Q Do you see the statement I'm referring to?</p> <p>4 A I do.</p> <p>5 Q Is it your testimony, as an expert on 11:42:58</p> <p>6 behalf of Cisco, that Cisco is not aware that Dell</p> <p>7 infringes Cisco's copyrighted works?</p> <p>8 A My testimony is exactly what it says in</p> <p>9 paragraph 168, that it's what Cisco pointed out in</p> <p>10 its interrogatory response. 11:43:16</p> <p>11 Q And what Cisco pointed out in its</p> <p>12 interrogatory response, according to you, is that</p> <p>13 Arista and Huawei are the only two companies that</p> <p>14 Cisco is aware of that is/was infringing Cisco CLI?</p> <p>15 Or infringing its copyrighted works? 11:43:37</p> <p>16 A That's what the sentence says.</p> <p>17 Q Knowing what you know about Dell CLI, you</p> <p>18 don't have any reason to believe that Dell is</p> <p>19 infringing Cisco's copyrighted works, either,</p> <p>20 correct? 11:43:49</p> <p>21 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>22 speculation, calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Knowing what I know is not</p> <p>24 sufficient to render an opinion one way or the</p> <p>25 other. There really isn't information -- sufficient 11:44:02</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p>	<p>1 A I believe I've answered that numerous -- 11:45:15</p> <p>2 question numerous times. It's going to be the same</p> <p>3 answer I gave before.</p> <p>4 Q Okay.</p> <p>5 A I think my report speaks for itself. And 11:45:22</p> <p>6 to the extent I haven't disagreed with some</p> <p>7 particular aspect doesn't mean that I've accepted</p> <p>8 what he said as correct.</p> <p>9 Q And your testimony, as an expert on behalf</p> <p>10 of Cisco, is that Cisco is not aware that D-Link is 11:45:36</p> <p>11 infringing Cisco's copyrighted works?</p> <p>12 A Again, I would refer to what I've said in</p> <p>13 paragraph 168, that at least based on its</p> <p>14 interrogatory responses, that Arista and Huawei are</p> <p>15 the only two companies Cisco is or was aware of that 11:45:58</p> <p>16 were infringing Cisco's copyrighted works.</p> <p>17 MR. HOLMES: I object to that question as</p> <p>18 calls for speculation and a legal conclusion.</p> <p>19 MR. SILBERT: Okay. You know, I'm going</p> <p>20 to switch gears, so why don't we break for lunch 11:46:11</p> <p>21 now, if that's okay.</p> <p>22 THE VIDEO OPERATOR: Going off the record,</p> <p>23 the time is 11:47 a.m.</p> <p>24 (Recess, 11:47 a.m. - 12:44 p.m.)</p> <p>25 THE VIDEO OPERATOR: Back on the record. 12:44:04</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p>



## HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

<p>1 same look and feel scientifically falsifiable? 12:56:30</p> <p>2 MR. HOLMES: Same objections.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I suspect that there are</p> <p>4 situations where you can look at two interfaces and</p> <p>5 determine that they don't have the same look and 12:56:41</p> <p>6 feel.</p> <p>7 As an example, if you had a GUI versus a</p> <p>8 CLI, I think that it would be difficult to conclude</p> <p>9 that they have the same look and feel.</p> <p>10 There are other aspects of the CLI that 12:56:56</p> <p>11 one could identify as potentially distinctive. They</p> <p>12 have different outputs. They use different</p> <p>13 commands, command structures, or something.</p> <p>14 I think that you could certainly make an</p> <p>15 argument that the look and feel of two interfaces 12:57:14</p> <p>16 was not the same.</p> <p>17 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>18 Q I understand you can make arguments. We</p> <p>19 get paid to do that.</p> <p>20 But my question to you is, is the 12:57:29</p> <p>21 assertion that two CLIs have the same look and feel</p> <p>22 scientifically falsifiable?</p> <p>23 MR. HOLMES: Same objections. Asked and</p> <p>24 answered.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: So if my previous answer 12:57:44</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p>	<p>1 I don't know if that makes it subjective, 12:59:27</p> <p>2 or to the extent that it is subjective, whether,</p> <p>3 really, just about anything is not subjective.</p> <p>4 I've offered the opinions that I've</p> <p>5 offered in the report. And whether somebody wants 12:59:41</p> <p>6 to argue that they're subjective or objective, I</p> <p>7 guess that's their own subjective analysis.</p> <p>8 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>9 Q What are the objective criteria that</p> <p>10 determine whether two CLIs have the same look and 12:59:56</p> <p>11 feel?</p> <p>12 A I think I've answered that question.</p> <p>13 The way to look at the criteria would be</p> <p>14 to assess its input mechanisms versus its output</p> <p>15 mechanisms, and either independently or together, 13:00:14</p> <p>16 perform an assessment of those aspects of the</p> <p>17 interface.</p> <p>18 And then within those aspects of the</p> <p>19 interface, you can really use a variety of both</p> <p>20 objective and subjective criteria, if I'm 13:00:32</p> <p>21 understanding how you're using the terms correctly.</p> <p>22 You can do things like a count of commands</p> <p>23 that are the same, similarities in the output, the</p> <p>24 structure of the commands. Any one or more of those</p> <p>25 things, depending on their similarity, would 13:00:55</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p>
<p>1 wasn't answering the question to your expectation, 12:57:45</p> <p>2 then I'm not sure I understand what "scientifically</p> <p>3 falsifiable" mean.</p> <p>4 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>5 Q Can it be proven wrong based on objective 12:57:56</p> <p>6 criteria?</p> <p>7 A You've introduced a concept of proof, and</p> <p>8 I understand that there are different burdens for</p> <p>9 proof: More likely than not, clear and convincing.</p> <p>10 It seems that what you're asking about is 12:58:27</p> <p>11 for, for example, an expert to make a determination.</p> <p>12 I believe an expert could make a</p> <p>13 determination and offer the opinion using some sort</p> <p>14 of methodology that two interfaces were -- had the</p> <p>15 same look and feels versus not. 12:58:47</p> <p>16 Q Is the determination of whether two CLIs</p> <p>17 have the same look and feel an objective</p> <p>18 determination or a subjective determination?</p> <p>19 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Vague, calls for</p> <p>20 a legal conclusion. 12:59:02</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure that I could</p> <p>22 characterize it one way or another. I think that as</p> <p>23 with just about anything, two experts could look at</p> <p>24 the same evidence and disagree for their own</p> <p>25 specific reasons. 12:59:26</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p>	<p>1 contribute to the overall conclusion of whether two 13:00:58</p> <p>2 interfaces have the same look and feel.</p> <p>3 Q Is there a minimum number of commands that</p> <p>4 need to be the same for two CLIs to have the same</p> <p>5 look and feel? 13:01:11</p> <p>6 A I don't think there has to be a minimum</p> <p>7 number. I think you have to consider all of the</p> <p>8 evidence. I don't think there's a threshold</p> <p>9 quantity.</p> <p>10 I think part of the analysis is to 13:01:23</p> <p>11 determine what the commands are and look at the</p> <p>12 similarities in commands. There might be other</p> <p>13 considerations like the similarities in command</p> <p>14 hierarchies, the similarity in output.</p> <p>15 Certainly there might be a hypothetical 13:01:42</p> <p>16 situation where many of the commands are similar,</p> <p>17 but the output is so distinctively different that it</p> <p>18 creates something that's different with respect to</p> <p>19 the look and feel.</p> <p>20 I mean, it seems that part of the analysis 13:01:56</p> <p>21 has to be based on the evidence that's available to</p> <p>22 do the analysis.</p> <p>23 Q Could two CLIs have the same look and feel</p> <p>24 if they have no overlapping multiword commands?</p> <p>25 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Calls for a 13:02:11</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p>

## HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

<p>1 hypothetical. 13:02:13</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: As a hypothetical, I'm</p> <p>3 always adverse to saying that it's not possible.</p> <p>4 It might be more difficult in the case</p> <p>5 where there's no overlapping commands. I don't know 13:02:28</p> <p>6 what other aspects of the system might contribute to</p> <p>7 a conclusion that there's the same look and feel.</p> <p>8 If it's a graphical interface and it's</p> <p>9 identical but the commands have slightly different</p> <p>10 names, or the output is identical -- and the output 13:02:49</p> <p>11 is identical, maybe those -- those considerations</p> <p>12 have an impact on whether it's the same look and</p> <p>13 feel.</p> <p>14 BY MR. SILBERT:</p> <p>15 Q Do two CLIs need to have the same modes 13:03:02</p> <p>16 and prompts for them to have the same look and feel?</p> <p>17 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Calls for a legal</p> <p>18 conclusion, incomplete hypothetical.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I think it's a similar</p> <p>20 answer to what I just said. I think it depends. 13:03:15</p> <p>21 You have to look at the evidence that's presented in</p> <p>22 order to make a determination. It depends on the</p> <p>23 other factors I've talked about and the degree to</p> <p>24 which the other factors are present. It really just</p> <p>25 depends. It might be, it might not be. 13:03:41</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p>	<p>1 determining the similarity between look and feel. 13:05:14</p> <p>2 Q To your knowledge, was that characteristic</p> <p>3 common to CLIs that existed before both Cisco and</p> <p>4 Arista?</p> <p>5 A As to your question of "common," I'm not 13:05:29</p> <p>6 sure what -- how prevalent it would need to be in</p> <p>7 order to make it common.</p> <p>8 And then you've also identified before</p> <p>9 Cisco and Arista CLIs, which are two different</p> <p>10 dates. I'm not sure which date you're intending. 13:05:45</p> <p>11 Q To your knowledge, did the TOPS-20 CLI</p> <p>12 allow a user to enter prefixes that would be</p> <p>13 expanded to complete commands or command words?</p> <p>14 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Vague as to time,</p> <p>15 foundation. 13:06:05</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: I have some recollection</p> <p>17 that -- something around that topic. I'd have to go</p> <p>18 back and look at the reports to see if it did or</p> <p>19 not.</p> <p>20 BY MR. SILBERT: 13:06:25</p> <p>21 Q You also mentioned tab expansion as</p> <p>22 something that can affect the look and feel of a</p> <p>23 CLI; is that right?</p> <p>24 A Again, I offered a whole list of examples.</p> <p>25 It could be something that one could use 13:06:39</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p>
<p>1 BY MR. SILBERT: 13:03:43</p> <p>2 Q When you refer to "other factors" that are</p> <p>3 talked about, some of the other factors you talked</p> <p>4 about is, other characteristics of the interface</p> <p>5 were the use of prefixes; is that correct? 13:03:58</p> <p>6 A I did mention the context of a prefix in a</p> <p>7 previous answer.</p> <p>8 Q And what did you mean when you referred to</p> <p>9 the use of prefixes as something that affects the</p> <p>10 look and feel of a CLI? 13:04:16</p> <p>11 A Sure. So one example might be in, say,</p> <p>12 Cisco and Arista where you're able to enter the</p> <p>13 prefix "EN" for enable instead of entering the full</p> <p>14 command, so the design concept within both user</p> <p>15 interfaces where you're able to enter just enough of 13:04:32</p> <p>16 the command so that the CLI can distinguish,</p> <p>17 disambiguate between commands.</p> <p>18 So since there's no other command that</p> <p>19 begins with EN, that EN is sufficient to notify the</p> <p>20 system that the user wants to go into privileged 13:04:52</p> <p>21 mode.</p> <p>22 And so that concept of entering a minimum</p> <p>23 syntactic length to disambiguate over other commands</p> <p>24 is a characteristic that's common to Cisco and</p> <p>25 Arista, and is a factor that I've considered in 13:05:11</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p>	<p>1 consistently across interfaces that might be a 13:06:44</p> <p>2 consideration. Not necessarily so, but maybe.</p> <p>3 Q Are the tab expansion characteristics in</p> <p>4 Cisco's and Arista's CLI similar?</p> <p>5 A I don't recall. I'd have to go back and 13:06:58</p> <p>6 check to the extent that they're there and how</p> <p>7 similar they are. I don't have that detail of both</p> <p>8 of the CLIs memorized.</p> <p>9 Q Is the availability of context-sensitive</p> <p>10 help a characteristic that affects a CLI's look and 13:07:20</p> <p>11 feel?</p> <p>12 MR. HOLMES: Objection. Vague.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure exactly what</p> <p>14 you mean by "context-sensitive help."</p> <p>15 BY MR. SILBERT: 13:07:38</p> <p>16 Q For example, pushing "question mark," and</p> <p>17 the CLI interface will return information that it</p> <p>18 thinks is relevant based on the particular context</p> <p>19 in which you pushed the question mark.</p> <p>20 A It's not clear from your question if 13:07:53</p> <p>21 you're entering a question mark after you've entered</p> <p>22 a portion of a command, and then you want to see,</p> <p>23 for example, the options that are available in the</p> <p>24 subtree of that command.</p> <p>25 Q Sure. Why don't you take that example. 13:08:05</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p>



## HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

<p>1 transcript as highly confidential, outside counsel 17:43:10</p> <p>2 only.</p> <p>3 (TIME NOTED: 5:43 p.m.)</p> <p>4 --o0o--</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>1 I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand</p> <p>2 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby</p> <p>3 certify:</p> <p>4 That the foregoing proceedings were taken</p> <p>5 before me at the time and place herein set forth;</p> <p>6 that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings,</p> <p>7 prior to testifying, were administered an oath; that</p> <p>8 a record of the proceedings was made by me using</p> <p>9 machine shorthand which was thereafter transcribed</p> <p>10 under my direction; that the foregoing transcript is</p> <p>11 a true record of the testimony given.</p> <p>12 Further, that if the foregoing pertains to</p> <p>13 the original transcript of a deposition in a Federal</p> <p>14 Case, before completion of the proceedings, review</p> <p>15 of the transcript [X] was [ ] was not requested.</p> <p>16 I further certify I am neither financially</p> <p>17 interested in the action nor a relative or employee</p> <p>18 of any attorney or any party to this action.</p> <p>19 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date</p> <p>20 subscribed my name.</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 Dated: 6/30/2016</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 &lt;%signature%&gt;</p> <p>25 CARLA SOARES</p> <p>CSR No. 5908</p>
<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 I, KEVIN C. ALMEROTH, do hereby declare</p> <p>9 under penalty of perjury that I have read the</p> <p>10 foregoing transcript; that I have made any</p> <p>11 corrections as appear noted, in ink, initialed by</p> <p>12 me, or attached hereto; that my testimony as</p> <p>13 contained herein, as corrected, is true and correct.</p> <p>14 EXECUTED this _____ day of _____,</p> <p>15 2016, at _____,</p> <p>16 (City) (State)</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 KEVIN C. ALMEROTH</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 294</p> <p>Page 296</p>
<p>Page 295</p>	